

1  
2 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
3 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

4 \* \* \*

5 NATHAN WILLIAMS,

6 Petitioner,

7 v.

8 BRIAN E. WILLIAMS, SR., *et al.*,

9 Respondents.  
10

Case No. 3:17-cv-00365-HDM-WGC

ORDER

11  
12 In this habeas corpus action, on August 6, 2018, the Court ruled on the  
13 respondents' motion to dismiss, granting it in part and denying it in part, dismissing  
14 certain of the claims of the *pro se* petitioner, Nathan Williams, and ordering the  
15 respondents to file an answer responding to the remaining claims. See Order entered  
16 August 6, 2018 (ECF No. 26). After a 45-day extension of time (ECF No. 28),  
17 Respondents' answer was due on December 20, 2018.


18 On December 20, 2018, Respondents filed a motion for an extension of time  
19 (ECF No. 29), requesting a second extension of time, this one 33 days, to January 22,  
20 2019 (January 21 is a holiday). Respondents' counsel states that the extension of time  
21 is necessary because of her obligations in other cases. The Court finds that  
22 Respondents' motion for extension of time is made in good faith and not solely for the  
23 purpose of delay, and that there is good cause for the extension of time requested.

24 **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that Respondents' Motion for Enlargement of  
25 Time (ECF No. 29) is **GRANTED**. Respondents will have until **January 22, 2019**, to file  
26 their answer.  
27  
28

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that, after the respondents file an answer, the petitioner will have 60 days to file a reply.

DATED THIS 27th day of December, 2018.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
HOWARD D. McKIBBEN,  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE